

---

# 7F

## Information/Action

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### Update on the Accreditation Review

---

**Executive Summary:** This item is an update on Commission activities related to accreditation of educator preparation. It contains general information about the timeline for the review of the Commission's accreditation policies and procedures, the transition to a revised system, and a general timeline of scheduled accreditation reviews. Both the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation are scheduled to meet the week prior to the Commission meeting. Staff will provide an oral update on the progress made at these meetings.

**Recommended Action:** No action is required at this time.

**Presenter:** Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, and Teri Clark, Consultant, Professional Services Division.

#### Strategic Plan Goal: 1

##### Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System, and State and Federal Funded Programs.

---

# Update on the Accreditation Review

---

## Introduction

For the past six months, the Accreditation Study Work Group, comprised of various stakeholders, has been working with the Committee on Accreditation in reviewing the Commission's policies and procedures related to the accreditation of institutions and districts that offer educator preparation programs. As of the date of the Commission meeting, the stakeholder group will have met a total of six times and two more meetings are currently scheduled, one for February and one for March 2005. The work group's recommendations will then be considered by the Committee on Accreditation which will, in turn, submit recommendations for Commission consideration at the June 2005 Commission meeting.

## Background

In 2003, the American Institutes for Research submitted a final report on its three-year independent evaluation of the Accreditation Framework thereby launching the Commission's review of its accreditation system. In January 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) directed the Committee on Accreditation to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. At its meeting in May 2004, the Commission authorized the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group. This work group, comprised of four members of the Committee on Accreditation and various representatives from the education stakeholder community, is charged with reviewing the Commission's current accreditation system and recommending any changes, if needed, to the Committee on Accreditation for its consideration. In turn, the Committee on Accreditation will submit its recommendations for changes to the system to the Commission for its consideration.

Following the Commission action in May 2004, the Committee on Accreditation, developed a general timeline for the review process as well as a concise list of deliverables and expectations for the work group. The Accreditation Work Group was formed in June 2004. Stakeholder groups appointed representatives to the work group. The COA selected four individuals from its membership to serve on the work group. In order to ensure that all perspectives are addressed, the work group is co-facilitated by one representative of the COA and one individual chosen by the stakeholders. Work group members are required to be vested with the authority to represent and speak on behalf of their institution, organization, or constituency group. To the extent possible, the work group operates on a consensus model, although it was agreed that, where significant differences in perspectives exist, these differences will be reflected in documentation. Each representative, with the exception of the COA members serving on the work group, commits to supporting the costs of its segmental participation in the review process. A list of Accreditation Study Work Group members is included as Attachment A to this agenda item.

## Timeline

The general timeline for the review of the accreditation system took into consideration the Commission's meeting schedule for 2004-05 as well as recognition that a key component of this review is to ensure frequent communication and interaction between the work group, the COA, and the Commission. The following chart illustrates the timeline for the review process.

December 2003 - January 2004	Commission directed Committee on Accreditation (COA) to work with stakeholders to determine a process for reviewing the current Accreditation Framework that is open, inclusive of stakeholder input, and transparent.
January 2004 – May 2004	COA and Commission staff met with representative stakeholder groups. COA recommended three options for moving forward with the review.
May 2004	Commission adopted COA recommendation for review process that includes formation of Accreditation Review Study Group comprised of: two representatives each from the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, the University of California, and the California State University; two representatives from K-12 school districts or COE with CCTC approved teacher education program; one representative each from California Teachers Association, California Federation of Teachers, Association of California School Administrators, California School Boards Association, CCTC approved induction programs, CCTC approved subject matter programs; and four representatives from the Committee on Accreditation.
June 2004	Accreditation Study Work Group members were appointed by stakeholders, began review process.
June 2004 –April 2005	Review process occurs. Process developed includes continuous communication and feedback between work group, the COA, and Commission. Field review to be conducted during spring 2005.
April - May 2005	Majority of the review process completed. Proposed changes will be finalized for consideration by the COA. COA's recommendations forwarded to the Commission for its consideration.
June 2005	Commission consideration of revised changes.
Summer 2005	Commission formal action on proposed changes. Implementation begins on revised system in accordance with transition plan.

As of the January/February 2005 Commission meeting, the work group will have met six times. Two additional meetings are currently planned. One is scheduled for February 16-17 and the second for March 16, 2005.

All agendas, meeting notes, and most materials are available on the Commission's website. Both the COA and work group meetings are open to the public. To date, the work group has discussed some of the numerous issues that fall under the umbrella of the accreditation of educator preparation. A brief summary of some of these issues was provided at the December 2004 Commission meeting. Because the Commission's agenda preparation timelines fell prior to the January meetings of both the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation, an oral update on the progress of these meetings will be provided by staff during this agenda item.

### **Limited Accreditation Site Visit Schedule**

In December of 2002 and, in subsequent action at the March 2004 Commission meeting, the Commission adopted a limited accreditation schedule that postponed all non-National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation visits for spring 2003 through the state fiscal year 2004-05 in order to allow for full implementation of the new SB 2042 teacher preparation standards and to conduct a review of the Commission's accreditation system.

Throughout the accreditation review process, the Commission directed that all accreditation site visits for institutions seeking initial or continuing NCATE accreditation be continued. The following chart shows the reviews that have either been conducted or plan to be conducted this fiscal year and those planned for the next two subsequent fiscal years.

### **NCATE/CCTC Accreditation Reviews Spring 2003 through Fiscal Year 2006-07**

<b>Spring 2003</b>		
San Diego State University	Continuing	Spring 2003
San Jose State University	Continuing	Spring 2003
Loyola Marymount University	Continuing	Spring 2003
<b>2003-04</b>		
California Lutheran University	Initial	Fall 2003
University of the Pacific	Continuing	Spring 2004
<b>2004-05</b>		
University of San Diego	Initial	Fall 2004
California State University, Los Angeles	Continuing	Fall 2004
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Continuing	Fall 2004
Sonoma State University	Initial	Spring 2005
<b>2005-06</b>		
California State University, Fresno	Continuing	March 2006

<b>2006-07</b>		
Azusa Pacific University	Continuing	Spring 07
California State University, San Marcos	Continuing	Spring 07
San Francisco State University	Continuing	Spring 07
California State University, Long Beach	Continuing	Spring 07
California State University, Monterey Bay	Initial	Fall 07
California State University, Chico	Initial	Spring 07

### **Transition Process**

As the Commission develops and adopts its policies related to accreditation, revised review processes and procedures will need to be developed to ensure adequate preparation and implementation of those policies. In addition, institutional and system representatives have maintained throughout the review process that sufficient lead time must be provided prior to any institution being scheduled for an accreditation review under a revised system. Institutional and system representatives have frequently and consistently communicated that 24 months lead time is necessary to budget sufficient resources and to prepare materials required. Because the review of the accreditation policies is incomplete at this time, and because the exact format and nature of the revised structure is still unknown, determining a precise start date for accreditation reviews under a revised system is difficult. However, the COA recommends that any transition process should include reasonable timelines, consideration of institutional budgeting and preparations required prior to a review, and that every effort must be made to ensure clear communication to the field regarding any revised policies and procedures the Commission may enact. To that end, the December 2004 agenda item on the update of the accreditation review included a list of principles in implementing a transition to a revised system. These included the following:

- The scheduling of future site level activity will take into account the order in which the institution or district was originally scheduled for a review prior to the postponement. In other words, those institutions that have had the longest periods between reviews will be among the first to be reviewed.
- New program sponsors that have never had an accreditation review beyond initial program approval will also be among the first to be reviewed. These program sponsors include California State University, Channel Islands; Argosy University; Inter-American College; Phillips Graduate Institute; Western Governor's University; Touro University; Orange County Office of Education; Stanislaus County Office of Education; William Jessup University; and High Tech High School. The format for review of new institutions may be formative in nature.

In transitioning to a revised system, the following activities would need to take place in 2005-06:

- Merged NCATE/CTC visits would continue in accordance with the existing protocol.
- The existing NCATE partnership and protocol would be reviewed to consider its alignment with the revised accreditation structure.
- A new Accreditation Handbook outlining the new procedures would be developed.
- Technical assistance would be provided to communicate the changes and requirements in the accreditation system to the field.
- Training sessions would be developed and conducted.

- Transitional reporting by all institutions would be required. The form and nature of the reporting would be informed by continuing work group discussions.
- Further consideration will be given to the development of a phase-in plan for implementation of new accreditation system procedures and requirements. A complete phase-in plan for full implementation would be needed for 2006-07 and beyond.

Commission comment would be helpful to the work group, the Committee on Accreditation, and staff as they prepare to meld the various perspectives and myriad ideas into a series of recommendations for Commission consideration in the next few months.

**Attachment A**  
**Accreditation Study Work Group**

***Representing the Independent California Colleges and Universities***

Ellen Curtis-Pierce  
Assistant Provost for Teacher Education  
Office of the Provost, Chapman University

Terrance Cannings, Dean  
School of Education and Behavioral  
Studies, Azusa Pacific University

***Representing the California State University***

Beverly Young (Work Group Co-Facilitator)  
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education  
and Public School Programs  
Office of the Chancellor,  
California State University

Iris Riggs  
Associate Dean, Division of  
Teacher Education  
College of Education  
CSU San Bernardino

***Representing the University of California***

Diane Mayer  
Associate Dean for Professional Programs  
UC Berkeley, Graduate School of Education

Barbara Merino  
Director of Teacher Education  
UC Davis, School of Education

***Representing the Association of  
California School Administrators***

Sonny DaMarto, Superintendent  
Burlingame Elementary School District

***Representing the California  
School Boards Association***

Luan Rivera, Vice President, CSBA  
Ramona Unified School District

***Representing the California  
Teachers Association***

Joyce Abrams  
Chula Vista Elementary School District

***Representing the California  
Federation of Teachers***

Sue Westbrook  
Senior Vice President, ECK-12 Council

***Representing Commission-approved  
Subject Matter Preparation Programs***

Claire Palmerino  
Director, Academic Advising Services  
Center for Careers in Teaching  
CSU Fullerton

***Representing Commission-approved  
Induction Programs***

Linda Childress  
BTSA Director  
RIMS (Riverside, Inyo, Mono,  
San Bernardino Counties) BTSA

***Representing Commission-approved Internship Program***

Mary Lewis, Administrator  
Alternative Certification and Teacher Support  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Margaret S. Fortune  
Executive Director  
Project Pipeline

***Representing the Committee on Accreditation***

Ed Kujawa (Work Group Co-Facilitator)  
Dean  
Dominican University of California

Lynne Cook  
Professor  
California State University, Northridge

Dana Griggs, Assistant Superintendent  
Ontario-Montclair School District

Karen O'Connor, Teacher  
Poway Unified School District